

JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

May 4, 2012
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

Minutes

Members Present:

Mr. Larry Barker
Chief Robert Berg
Judge Jeanette Dalton (phone)
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. Rich Johnson
Mr. Marc Lampson
Ms. Barb Miner
Judge Steven Rosen
Ms. Yolande Williams
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Members Absent:

Mr. Jeff Hall
Judge James Heller
Judge J. Robert Leach
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Mr. Steward Menefee
Ms. Aimee Vance

Guests Present:

Mr. Shayne Boyd
Mr. Gary Egner
Ms. Lea Ennis
Ms. Betty Gould

AOC/Temple Staff Present:

Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Dan Belles
Ms. Kathy Bradley
Mr. Bill Burke
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Mr. Mike Davis
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Martin Kravik
Ms. Vicky Marin
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso
Mr. Mike Walsh
Mr. Craig Wilson
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Mr. Doug Klunder
Mr. Allen Mills
Mr. Eric Olson
Mr. Kyle Snowden
Mr. Joe Wheeler

Call to Order

Justice Mary Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

March 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes to the March 2 meeting minutes. Hearing no changes, Justice Fairhurst deemed them approved.

JIS Budget Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan presented the committee with the JIS budget report (green sheet). This report shows the current JIS allocations, expenditures and variations.

Mr. Radwan presented the blue sheet which shows the allocation and expenditure by phase and fiscal year for the SC-CMS project. This is a projection of how funds will be expended. We will adjust this upon completion of the staffing plan and when more detail is available.

13-15 Biennium Budget Process

Mr. Ramsey Radwan presented the committee with a schedule for the 13-15 Budget Development and Submittal Process. We are on track for meeting these dates. The JIS decision packages will

go to the Supreme Court for approval as submitted by Justice Fairhurst, Mr. Radwan, and Mr. Hall.

Mr. Radwan also pointed out potential funding concerns that he intends to frame all funding requests around. Mr. Radwan stated we as the judicial branch start out with a \$20 million dollar issue. The JSTA account is due to sunset at the end of the biennium. If that sunset is not extended or made permanent we need to be backfill in general fund.

Based on current information, the state may be facing a \$1.5 billion state general fund deficit in the 13-15 biennium. If the state judicial branch were to take its share of the deficit, we would be faced with an additional \$10.6 million shortfall.

IT Governance Requests – Approval and Prioritization

Mr. Kevin Ammons presented IT Governance Request #062 – Automate Court’s County Department Cross Reference Table (DCXT) Entries. Mr. Ammons explained that this request would automate most portions of the effort at each court to update Budgeting, Accounting, and Reporting System (BARS) codes after most legislative sessions. After discussion regarding the request, a motion to authorize and prioritize the request was made.

Motion: Yolande Williams: I move this request be approved by the JISC.

Second: Judge Wynne

Voting in Favor: All present (Judge Dalton, phone)

Opposed: None

Absent: Mr. Jeff Hall, Judge James Heller, Judge J. Robert Leach, Ms. Marti Maxwell, Mr. Steward Menefee

Mr. Ammons then facilitated the prioritization of the request into the existing JISC ITG priorities.

Motion: Chief Berg: I move to prioritize this request between priority 9 and 10 (after JRS replacement)

Second: Mr. William Holmes

Voting in Favor: All present (Judge Dalton, phone)

Opposed: None

Absent: Mr. Jeff Hall, Judge James Heller, Judge J. Robert Leach, Ms. Marti Maxwell, Mr. Steward Menefee

The JISC prioritized IT Governance Request 062 as the #10 priority. The JISC's adopted priority list is:

Priority	ITG #	Request Name	Status	JISC Importance
1	121	Superior Court Data Exchange	In Progress	High
2	002	Superior Court Case Management System	In Progress	High
3	045	Appellate Courts EDMS	In Progress	High
4	009	Add Accounting Data to the Data Warehouse	In Progress	High
5	041	Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records	In Progress	High
6	081	Implement Static Risk Tool, STRONG 2	In Progress	High
7	027	Expanded Seattle Municipal Court Case Data	Authorized	High

		Transfer		
8	102	New Case Management System to Replace JIS (DISCIS)	Authorized	High
9	85	JRS Replacement	Authorized	High
10	062	Automate Court's DCXT Table Entries	Authorized	Medium
11	007	SCOMIS Field for CPG	Authorized	Medium
12	026 & 031	Prioritize Restitution Recipients and Combine True Name and Aliases for Time Pay	Authorized	Medium

ITG #2 - SC-CMS Update

Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso, project manager, provided an update of the SC-CMS project beginning with the completion of the Technical Requirements and the Request for Proposal (RFP) Draft Contract. Both documents are included in the RFP as Exhibits. Also completed was the SC-CMS project presentation at the Washington State Association of County Clerks (WSACC) Spring Conference in March 2012 and at the Superior Court Judicial Association (SCJA) and the Association of Washington Superior Court Administrators (AWSCA) Spring Conference in April 2012. The highlights of the presentation were the guest speakers (a County Clerk, Administrator, and Judge) from Hamilton County, Indiana. The Independent Quality Assurance Professionals (QAPs) were mentioned as presenters after this presentation to go over the details of their initial quality assurance assessment report.

The RFP status was reported in its third iteration of review by the RFP Steering Committee, AOC Internal Sponsors, Project Team, Special Assistant Attorney General (SAAG), QAPs, Attorney General's Office, and Judge Marcine Anderson. This review process is a two week review rather than the originally slated two day review due to the feedback received from most reviewers, including the SAAG and the QAPs, that the schedule in place was too aggressive, thus impacting the quality review of the RFP. As a result, the schedule was revisited and changed to address the concerns received and to ensure that this RFP process is done right the first time. The revised schedule now allows adequate review of the RFP and allows adequate delivery of tasks throughout the entire schedule for Phase I.

Ms. Sapinoso also reviewed the calendar of the RFP review process focusing on the areas where the JISC members' time would be requested to review the RFP (from June 6 – June 15) including the JISC RFP briefings scheduled for June 13 and 14. There will be two sessions per day from 9:00am – 12:00pm and 1:00pm – 4:00pm to walk through the RFP and address any questions or concerns in regards to the RFP. June 22 is the next JISC meeting and the committee will be asked to approve release of the RFP. Last, Ms. Sapinoso emphasized that the entire project schedule represented in the phased timeline of the presentation is subject to change pending the Apparent Successful Vendor and the results of contract negotiations.

Court Business Office (CBO)

Mr. Dirk Marler presented an overview of the Court Business Office. The SC-CMS Feasibility Study described a number of critical tasks for configuration and implementation the new case management system that will be facilitated by the CBO.

The CBO has been created to serve the courts of the State of Washington in the implementation and deployment of the court Case Management Systems. The CBO helps transform and improve court business automation and processes through expert requirements refinement, process

management, and collaboration with the court community and within AOC. The CBO will rely on a Court User Work Group (CUWG) to help identify opportunities for optimizing and standardizing business processes and to assist in communication with stakeholders. The CUWG will need an appropriate level of decision-making authority to make timely decisions on the statewide configurations and business process standards for statewide implementation. The governing bodies will assign members to represent them on the CUWG. Members of the CUWG should have a state wide and system wide view of court operations, and shall pursue the best interests of the court system at large.

The CBO will facilitate decisions that need to be made at the local level. The local court, no matter how small will be in a leadership and decision making position in planning for local implementation. The solution provider, in partnership with AOC and local courts, will configure and customize the application to support Washington superior court rules and procedures and will work with judicial officers, administrators, clerks, and staff to configure, train, and integrate new processes into their operation.

A follow up presentation along with a draft charter will be given at the June 22 JISC meeting.

JIS Modernization Roadmap (Portfolio Refresh)

Mr. Kumar Yajamanam along with Mr. Craig Wilson presented the JIS Portfolio Modernization roadmap. Mr. Yajamanam started by stating that there was an aging JIS portfolio of primary applications, modernization of which is a complex effort. Mr. Yajamanam presented the background information that the question on the existence of a modernization roadmap was asked in December 2011 JISC meeting. This presentation was an attempt to answer the question with a modernization strategy and not to provide a specific roadmap. The modernization strategy & approach was in alignment with the IT Governance processes as well as with Ernst & Young Strategic Plan and AOC Enterprise Architecture future state roadmap. The objectives of the presentation were to provide an insight into the current state of JIS portfolio and to provide an approach that would help guide IT investments and future planning at statewide and local levels.

Mr. Craig Wilson then presented an overview of the current state of the JIS Application Portfolio. There are more than 30 computer applications that support the business activity of the courts. A current sustainability risk assessment was presented for the 10 primary JIS applications. The assessment indicates that several applications will be difficult or challenging to sustain at current levels without negative impact to users.

Mr. Yajamanam then stated that the modernization plan should focus on enabling a mix of COTS-based and custom developed applications. He emphasized alignment with JIS Baseline services. In addition, he stated that the order of preference for modernization options was to 1) reuse, 2) re-factor, 3) buy and 4) build. He then presented replacement, enhancement, new and retirement candidate applications and the court-level portfolio modernization transition and target states. He highlighted the support issues for a portfolio in transition state to maintain legislative updates, enhancements, break-fixes and integration needs, emphasizing that the greater the portfolio size in transition state, greater are the risks and support costs.

Some key observations included that the portfolio will become complex to very complex before becoming simple and that the longer we need to maintain dual applications, the more difficult it would be to manage change. Key recommendations included driving standardization for business processes and minimization on the variations in configurations, choosing modernization scope

based on holistic view of court level portfolio to minimize disruptions to courts and reducing the technology platforms required to support application.

Mr. Yajamanam then presented a 2-2-2 Modernization strategy where he recommended modernizing an application and rolling it out to all the courts that use that function in under two (2) biennium(s). During that period, he recommended focusing on two additional application modernization preparations that could be executed in the next two biennium(s).

The presentation concluded with a recommendation that while technology modernization was complex, services for agile on-boarding of courts to new applications needed vast improvements and that robust services for on-boarding Courts to applications was the most critical factor for succeeding in JIS portfolio modernization.

JIS Priority Project Status Reports

ITG #121 - Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX)

Mr. Bill Burke, project manager, stated that testing of SCDX Increment 1 is continuing to slip due to insufficient QA Test team resources. The QA team has been engaged in testing the software deliverables from the Natural to Cobol (N2C) and Adult Risk Assessment (ARA) projects. This has significantly impacted the QA team availability to complete SCDX Increment 1 testing. Testing of SCDX Increment 1 is currently expected to be completed by the end of May. SCDX Increment 2 development is on-schedule. Sierra Systems has completed the final set of Technical Design Documents for SCDX web services and these documents are currently being reviewed by the AOC. In addition, Sierra Systems has completed and delivered to the AOC over half of the SCDX Increment 2 web services. The Pierce County LINX team has assigned (2) developers to begin planning the development work for building the interface between the LINX System and the SCDX. This development planning is currently in-work and a project completion date for this effort has not yet been identified.

Question: I thought that the Pierce County LINX team had identified 1st Quarter of 2012 for starting the development for this interface?

Answer: Yes, we have been meeting with the Pierce County LINX team monthly since July 2011 and the estimated start for the development was always defined as 1st Quarter 2012.

ITG #45 - Appellate Court Electronic Document Management System (EDMS)

Mr. Bill Burke stated that ten (10) EDMS vendors responded to the project Request for Information (RFI) and of those vendors, seven (7) provided EDMS product demonstrations. From the vendor responses and product demonstrations, it appears that this is mature product market and many vendor products have a robust set of standard features. The number of vendors responding to the RFI would indicate a fair amount of interest by vendors in providing an EDMS solution to the AOC. The project is currently engaged in evaluating EDMS systems design options. One of the EDMS design options being evaluated would provide the Appellate Courts with all the required ACORDS functionality from the EDMS workflows, so that a custom interface between the EDMS and ACORDS would not be needed.

Question: Has the Appellate Courts EDMS project exceeded the JISC authorized project scope? This project was suppose to deploy an EDMS not replace ACORDS.

Answer: The JISC authorized the project to deploy an Appellate Courts EDMS. When the project team began evaluating system design options, it became apparent that interfacing to the existing ACORDS system has substantial risk and significant cost associated with the development of a custom interface between the EDMS and ACORDS. ACORDS is an undocumented system and the AOC has repeatedly had problems implementing any ACORDS changes. By interfacing the new EDMS to ACORDS will constrain EDMS functionality and require the Appellate Court users to use both an EDMS and ACORDS concurrently, adding additional complexity to the Appellate Court operations. While this evaluation is still in-work, the results will be reviewed with the Appellate Court Clerks on May 8 and the project Executive Steering Committee on June 5. If the Executive Steering Committee decides to recommend that the EDMS provide all required ACORDS functionality, then this recommendation will be presented to JISC on June 22 for approval.

Question: Will the new EDMS store only documents?

Answer: No, the new EDMS will have the capability to store all electronic media which includes documents, transcripts, pictures and audio files.

ITG 81 Static Adult Risk Assessment (ARA) Project

Mr. Martin Kravik presented the final JISC report on the Adult Static Risk Assessment project. Mr. Kravik reported that all project objectives have been met. In the current period, quality assurance testing was completed, defects were corrected, and the user manual was completed.

The system was placed into a production pilot on April 20th making the system available for use to the implementation courts (Clark, Cowlitz, Kittitas, Spokane, and Thurston). As of May 4th, 187 assessments had been created by Spokane and Thurston counties.

A notification was sent out on May 4th to all trial courts announcing the broad availability of the static risk assessment system.

Remaining project deliverables include full transition to ongoing program support and closing out the project. An effort has begun to form a permanent oversight committee. Both Superior and Courts of Limited Jurisdictions will be represented.

Vehicle Related Violations (VRV) Project

Mr. Mike Walsh, project manager, reported all three Tier 1 pilot courts, Lakewood, Issaquah, and Kirkland are using the VRV web services. The number of monthly VRV records processed so far are meeting the projections made nearly two years ago (Kirkland 570, Issaquah 475, Lakewood 1170). The VRV Tier 2 pilot courts Fife, Tacoma, and Lynnwood, are working with their web services providers and are primed to start the process of connecting to JINDEX and testing the end to end transaction processing. The web services providers, CodeSmart and ATS, are the same companies that built the connections for the Tier 1 courts.

There is currently a 10 week delay in initiating the Tier 2 connectivity with the Department of Enterprise Services' (DES), JINDEX message routing component. The delay is created by a change in the completion date of a project DES resources are currently working on.

The AOC Operations team is in place and is ramping up to support the VRV on boarding process at the conclusion of the Pilot Tier 2 implementation. Although the Committee had requested the names for the next group of VRV courts none have been identified so far. Mr. Rich Johnson replied to the Committee that the decision is tasked to the Data Management Steering Committee.

Information Networking Hub (INH) Program Overview and Status

Mr. Dan Belles, project manager provided an update on the Information Networking Hub (INH) Project. Mr. Belles gave an overview of the current program scope, activities, schedule and next steps in the project. Mr. Belles also shared an overview of the INH project scope to include the Pilot services and Foundation components. Next he gave a brief update on current project activities including planning and design of the Pilot services and Foundation components.

Mr. Belles included an overview of the current INH schedule, explaining the project's progress within the timeline starting in 2012 and continuing through the first half of 2015. Mr. Belles also stated that the project's first deliverable would be the two Pilot services, expected to be completed by the end of June 2012. The Foundation is expected to be completed later this year with the SC-CMS ready solution was targeted for completion in early 2014. The focus is for INH to be SC-CMS ready but the designs and templates could be used for any court system that wanted to connect, provided they were ready. Mr. Belles concluded his presentation by covering the next steps in the project which would focus on continuing the work on the analysis and design of the foundation components and development of the Pilot services.

Judge Thomas Wynn asked if INH was something new that AOC was creating or had it been done before. Mr. Belles responded that the INH concept was not new and that several implementations have been done in the private and public sectors. Mr. Belles also shared the State of Colorado is implementing an INH like solution and that we plan to contact them for information.

Ms. Yolanda Williams asked if the INH ADR web service was previously requested by the JISC. Vonnie Diseth, ISD CIO, responded that this was something AOC had been working on with the Department of Licensing for some time and that it would save them money by allowing them to shut down some COBOL programs that only AOC is still using. Ms. Williams then asked about implementation of the Seattle Muni data exchange and if and when that was going to be done during the INH and SC-CMS schedule.

Ms. Barb Miner asked about the INH timeline and when data exchanges might be available to non-SC-CMS systems. Mr. Belles responded that when INH was ready for SC-CMS we could take a look at the services and possibly make them available to other systems depending on the court's requirements and their ability to do the work on their side.

Committee Reports

Data Dissemination Committee:

No Report

Data Management Steering Committee:

Mr. Kevin Ammons reported on behalf of Mr. Rich Johnson. The Accounting Data in the Data Warehouse project has released the third increment. The fourth increment is expected to be released in June.

The project schedule will be reevaluated by the project workgroup in August as the project reaches the half-way point. The project schedule may be able to be accelerated for the last half of the project.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be June 22, 2012, at AOC SeaTac Facility; from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Action Items:

	Action Items – From March 4th 2011 Meeting	Owner	Status
1	At the end of the legislative session, ask the Supreme Court Rules Committee if it wants the Data Dissemination Committee to revisit GR15 in light of <i>Ishikawa</i> and <i>Bone-Club</i> .	Vicky Marin, Justice Fairhurst	<u>Postponed</u>
	Action Items – From October 7th 2011 Meeting		
3	Confer with the BJA on JISC bylaw amendment regarding JISC communication with the legislature.	Justice Fairhurst	
	Action Items – From December 2nd 2011 Meeting		
5	Present JIS application portfolio plan to the JISC.	Vonnie Diseth	Completed – 05/04/12
6	Present to the JISC a schedule for work on ITG projects prioritized by the JISC on December 2 nd .	Vonnie Diseth	Postponed
7	Discuss with Pierce County reduction of payment for double-data entry following completion of SCDX Increment 1.	Jeff Hall	Done/In progress
	Action Items – From March 2nd 2012 Meeting		
8	Send Appellate Court Electronic Document Management System use case notes to Larry Barker.	Bill Burke	Completed
9	Check on whether it is possible to reload archived CLJ cases into active tables without making them available to web search on the public website.	Dan Belles	
	Action Items – From May 4th 2012 Meeting		
10	Create a document showing the difference between the costs associated with COTS-Prep versus INH.	Mike Davis	